1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA ***
7	CONNIE MCDANEL,
8	Plaintiff(s), 2:17-cv-00492-GMN-NJK
9	vs. $\frac{\mathbf{O} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}}$
10	MICHAEL G. MCDANEL,
11	Defendant(s).
12)
13	Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to extend the deadline to prepare and
14	submit a discovery plan and proposed scheduling order. Docket No. 29. The parties ask the Court
15	to suspend the deadline for them to submit a proposed discovery plan until ten days after the Court's
16	resolution of two pending dispositive motions because, they submit, the outcome of those motions
17	will impact the scope of discovery. <i>Id.</i> at 1-2. The mere pendency of a dispositive motion does not
18	delay the parties' discovery obligations. Cf. Little v. City of Seattle, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir.
19	1988). Moreover, the parties present no authority to support the relief they seek.
20	Accordingly, the parties' stipulation to extend the deadline to prepare and submit a discovery
21	plan and proposed scheduling order, Docket No. 29, is hereby DENIED . The parties shall submit
22	either a stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order, or a renewed stipulation to suspend
23	the deadline for filing a proposed discovery plan supported by appropriate authority, no later than
24	April 17, 2017.
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.
26	DATED: April 10, 2017.
27	NANCY J. KOPPE
28	United States Magistrate Judge